February 20, 1975

SENATOR SAVAGE: The motion fails. The Chair recognizes Senator Marsh.

SENATOR MARSH: Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion to advance LB 75.

SENATOR SAVAGE: Motion is to advance LB 75 to E & R initial. Record your vote.

CLERK: Senator Savage voting aye.

SENATOR SAVAGE: Have you all voted? Record the vote. Senator Chambers voting aye. Sorry about that.

CLERK: 28 ayes, 6 nays, 15 not voting.

SENATOR SAVAGE: Motion advanced. The bill is advanced. Next bill is LB 98 CA, constitutional amendment.

CLERK: Read bill.

SENATOR SAVAGE: Chair recognizes Senator Syas.

SENATOR SYAS: The amendments were offered to us by Senator Cavanaugh, so I'll let Senator Cavanaugh handle the amendments.

CLERK: On page 2, line 1 strike "general" and insert "primary". Page 2, strike "November" and insert "May", after "provide" insert an underscored comma, after "four" insert a period "not to exceed five years". After "of" strike "land" and insert "the increase in the assessed valuation of structures". Line 17, after "purposes" strike "and" and insert "due to". Line 19 strike "obsolete" and after "decayed" and strike the underscored. Signed, Senator Syas.

SENATOR SAVAGE: The Chair recognizes Senator Cavanaugh.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: LB 98 is a constitutional amendment to provide . . . to authorize the Legislature, by general law, to provide a system whereby improvements to decadent or blighted resident, single-family dwelling, residential areas that the improvements to these structures not increase the assessment to the structure for up to a period not to exceed five years. The amendments relate to setting in that criteria of five years which the committee was concerned about and which I think is a reasonable period of time. Originally the bill was drafted . . . the Legislature could have set the time limit. What this bill is designed to do is that when you have a decadent or a blighted home, an individual seeks to improve it, as a result of his improvement the assessed value increases. As a result his tax burden increases. I think that the affect of this is to discourage improvements in older homes. The consequent affect is to encourage continued deterioation of older homes in the State of Nebraska. It's my feeling that this tax policy of ours works counter to other policies that we attempt to implement and that the Federal government attempts to implement. The Federal government has numerous housing development programs in which they pour millions of dollars into the State of Nebraska and other states throughout the country to encourage the redevelopment of older homes. At the same time we have